



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,755	08/28/2001	Nikhil M. Deshpande	884.493US1	5778
21186	7590	06/25/2009	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			CHANKONG, DOHM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2452	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: NIKHIL DESHPANDE

Appeal 2008-005174
Application No. 09/940,755
Technology Center 2400

Mailed: June 25, 2008

Before DALE M. SHAW *Chief Appeals Administrator.*

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on August 3, 2006. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No. 2008-005174 was assigned on August 15, 2008. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Application 09/940,755
Appeal 2008-005174

Claims 1-6 of the instant application is set forth as a method claim that may not fall with one of the four statutory categories of invention recited in 35 U.S.C. § 101. On May 15, 2008, the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examining Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled “Clarification of “Processes” under 35 U.S.C. § 101.” This memorandum is further used in conjunction with the Interim Guidelines and the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2106.IV.B, when determining whether a claimed invention falls within a statutory category of invention. *See In re Bilski*, No. 2007-1130, ___ F.3d ___, 2008 WL 4757110 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 30, 2008) (en banc). Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 1-6 meets the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 1-6 meets the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DMS/tsj

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402